

Date: Sat, 20 Feb 93 04:30:18 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #44
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 20 Feb 93 Volume 93 : Issue 44

Today's Topics:

 Abandonment of CW
 Closed repeaters
 Eliminate the Written Exam (6 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 19 Feb 93 19:12:59 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Abandonment of CW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Robert W. McGwier, N4HY says:

[..... deleted] No code is a
success if you define it as only increasing numbers of hams. Time will
tell if it has been a success in that people move up the incentive trail.

I say:

This is a part of the conventional snobbish ARRL "Incentive licensing"
view (the same one that just sees Techs as stepping stones to "real"
licenses). The Tech is a licence that stands on its own. There are
plenty of things to do on 6m and above that could keep a person fully
occupied for a lifetime. They need never upgrade unless they want to
play with HF.

The real measure of the success of amateur radio is if they're still interested in amateur radio after 5 to 10 years. If all they play with is 2m FM then we will loose a lot of them in the first couple of years through boredom if nothing else. Some may return later.

Bob also said:

[..... deleted] We are going to come under increasing pressure from the deletion of those bands where we hold secondary status because of the elimination of the primary user (DOD) and we must not be seen as bickering over the edges (no pun intended).

I say:

Ham radio's most valuable spectrum for the future is at VHF and above, the Tech's domain, and it is tremendously underused. We stand a good chance of loosing it (piecewise at first) if it isn't colonised. The incentive licensing scheme has nothing of value to offer in for protecting the "high frontier". In the next decade we will see the expansion of high data rate digital techniques which will require this spectrum.

We have a new ham radio frontier: UHF/microwave plus computers. It is the new tech's will need to colonise it.

Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP (UK no-code "tech" for 13 years)
a-kevinp@microsoft.com
"We conjure the spirits of the computer with our spells"

Date: 19 Feb 93 09:38:02
From: news.service.uci.edu!ucivax!ofa123!Larry.Mc.Donald@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Closed repeaters
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu

(Jay Maynard) sez:

> In article <mnzs9!l@dixie.com> jgd@dixie.com (John De Armond) writes:
>>Well, you can rant and rave and wave your arms all you like but the fact
>>remains, if the cactus boys charge an admission fee to their closed
>>little world, they are as illegal as hell.
>
> If you're so all-fired sure about this, then FILE A COMPLAINT!!!

Hey! An excellent idea! Maybe we can get all these posts about closed/private repeaters off of the net and in the FCC's mailbox where it belongs. I'm sure if all of us who have not

been "invited" to use the private bands wrote to the FCC, something would happen. I've written to and been ignored by the ARRL, so the only other folks to write to are the FCC. 'Corse the amateurs might lost these 'private' bands, but since I've not been "invited" to operate there, what do I care? At least the FCC, who claim to be short on cash, should rent these freqs to the folks who insist we pay rent to them.

Posting here on the Usenet on this subject sure doesn't seem to be a very productive use of rhetoric.

... Brea, California: Beyond Ugliness, Beyond Belief.
___ Blue Wave/QWK v2.10

--- Maximus 2.01wb

Date: Fri, 19 Feb 1993 11:55:49 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!mpg!tony@ames.arpa
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1142@arrl.org> jlbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom) writes:
>In rec.radio.amateur.policy, perry@hpfco.FC.HP.COM (Perry Scott) writes:
>>Nice sarcasm, Alan. Too bad it will be lost on a few.
>
>A few?

How can it be 'nice' if it was lost on a lot of people? If you read this newsgroup, you might do so because you're interested in the opinions of other folks who may be at least as intelligent as you are. If one assumes that, and the sarcasm was lost on all these intelligent folks, then the sarcasm wasn't effectively delivered was it? So how can it be 'nice'? On the other hand, you may believe this newsgroups readers are dumber than you are. In that case, wouldn't you think that the posting would be lost on the reader audience anyway, so why post it as sarcasm in the first place? For that matter, why would you continue to be a participant/reader of the newsgroup?

>Perry and Gary (sounds like a vaudeville team!) win the cookies for
>being the only posters with enough brains to recognize sarcasm when
>they read it.

What's the point? As with most poorly done sarcastic Usenet postings, the folks who usually catch the sarcasm are those who are familiar with previous posts of the sender or know him/her. With the lack of non-verbal cues to hint that the poster is attempting to be funny, anyone else has no choice but

assume the post is sincere. I've run into enough people in the hobby to know that there are quite a few of them who would agree with the original message. If a person posts a message to Usenet, sarcastic or sincere, on a topic where there is wide diversity of opinion, one can expect most readers to take the message at face value and respond appropriately. Attempting to ridicule those who responded sincerely to a sorry attempt at 'sarcasm' is at best pointless and a waste of time, at worst arrogant and obnoxious.

--

Antonio Querubin

tony@mpg.phys.hawaii.edu / ah6bw@uhm.ampr.org / querubin@uhunix.bitnet

Date: 19 Feb 1993 07:39:36 GMT
From: cronkite.cisco.com!dstine@ames.arpa
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <103380022@hpfcs0.FC.HP.COM> perry@hpfcs0.FC.HP.COM (Perry Scott) writes:

>Nice sarcasm, Alan. Too bad it will be lost on a few.

If it was sarcasm, it was some far too subtle sarcasm for the media by which it was conveyed.

I've heard elimination of the written exams proposed before many times by those who are simply too lazy to work for the privileges. So if Alan is going to try to pass this off as sarcasm, he should first consider the company that I and others will presume him to keep from the content of his suggestion before he makes it anything less than obvious that he is having a go at those who would like everything for nothing.

I'll stand by my flame and I'll relish crafting yet further flames for those who are proponents of a system which caters to the least common denominator of sheer laziness.

dsa

Date: Fri, 19 Feb 1993 01:05:05 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hpl-opus!hpnmdla!alanb@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, lee@soda.berkeley.edu (Lee Thompson-Herbert) writes:

>CW is easy if and only if the student can read and write at the
>neccesary speed. And one-letter-at-a-time is significantly harder
>than word-at-a-time processing.

Except that at the slower speeds (≤ 13 wpm), people generally DO copy one letter at a time. At these speeds, by the time you get to the last "n" in "communication", you will usually have forgotten the first part of the word!

AL N1AL

Date: 19 Feb 1993 21:30:20 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!soda.berkeley.edu!lee@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <14600045@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com> alanb@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom) writes:

```
>
>Except that at the slower speeds (<= 13 wpm), people generally DO copy
>one letter at a time.  At these speeds, by the time you get to the last
>"n" in "communication", you will usually have forgotten the first part
>of the word!
```

Maybe you missed my point. Even if I `_do_` copy down those letters one at a time, I may miss the message. I read `_words_`, not letters. So trying to separate word boundaries gets hairy.

Hello, I can't copy _phone_numbers_ when _spoken_ to me if I'm not listening very carefully. Because the numbers taken together don't have any intrinsic meaning. They're just a jumble of digits. Most of the arguments about the ease of CW fall apart when they have to deal with someone who has problems copying from spoken word (or audible signal) or written word. I can read, but I can't take dictation.

```
>shrug< So I'll probably stay a Tech forever.
```

I just hate to see the snobby attitude that "CW is easy to learn, and if you haven't learned it, you're just lazy."

[illegible]

\\Semper Bi "Ave Fortuna, Imperatrix Mundi!"

>>>>

Date: Fri, 19 Feb 1993 22:19:11 GMT

From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!
ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C2p2H2.Cxt@news.Hawaii.Edu> tony@mpg.phys.hawaii.edu (Antonio
Querubin) writes:

>In article <1142@arrl.org> jbbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom) writes:

>>Perry and Gary (sounds like a vaudeville team!) win the cookies for
>>being the only posters with enough brains to recognize sarcasm when
>>they read it.

>

>What's the point? As with most poorly done sarcastic Usenet postings, the
>folks who usually catch the sarcasm are those who are familiar with previous
>posts of the sender or know him/her. With the lack of non-verbal cues to hint
>that the poster is attempting to be funny, anyone else has no choice but
>assume the post is sincere. I've run into enough people in the hobby to know
>that there are quite a few of them who would agree with the original message.
>If a person posts a message to Usenet, sarcastic or sincere, on a topic where
>there is wide diversity of opinion, one can expect most readers to take the
>message at face value and respond appropriately. Attempting to ridicule those
>who responded sincerely to a sorry attempt at 'sarcasm' is at best pointless
>and a waste of time, at worst arrogant and obnoxious.

Sounds like a fish gasping and flopping after being caught on the hook. :-)

Alan was trying to make a point about the arguments for no-code licensing.
It was a lame point, but it did hook a number of you. He tried to illustrate
why he thought the no-code arguments were weak by presenting a facetious
case for eliminating the theory exam, saying that it "filtered out" desirable
potential amateurs. This is in mockery of those who suggest that Morse exams
filter out potentially desirable amateurs.

That would be a telling point if the purpose of licensing and exams
was to "filter out" undesirables. But that has no regulatory standing.
The actual purpose of licensing is to act to reduce cases of interference
to "important" services such as broadcasting and safety services. Thus
knowledge of the causes and cures of interfering operation must be demonstrated
by the potential licensee. That requires demonstrating some knowledge
of electrical theory and regulatory limits. In ancient days, it also required
a proficiency in Morse code to *identify* stations being interfered with,
and stations causing interference. That's no longer the case with the
"important" services' abandonment of Morse.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Fri, 19 Feb 93 23:28:26 GMT

From: mentor.cc.purdue.edu!noose.ecn.purdue.edu!en.ecn.purdue.edu!n9ljx@purdue.edu

Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <14600044@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com> alanb@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom) writes:

>

>By the way, all these arguments hold equally well for the code exam.

>If you believe the code exam should be eliminated, then the same

>arguments hold for the written exam as well.

>

>AL N1AL

>

For all of you who are claiming that this was weak sarcasm I suggest you reread this past passage. It sets the whole post in proper perspective.

--sas

--

Scott Stambaugh - N9LJX	internet: n9ljx@ecn.purdue.edu
Operations Supervisor, ADPC	phone: 317 494 7946
Purdue University	
West Lafayette, IN 47907-1061	

Date: 20 Feb 93 02:23:36 GMT

From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!stanford.edu!CSD-

NewsHost.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1142@arrl.org>, <C2p2H2.Cxt@news.Hawaii.Edu>,

<1993Feb19.221911.9572@ke4zv.uucp>ewsHost

Subject : Re: Eliminate the Written Exam

gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

>Alan was trying to make a point about the arguments for no-code licensing.
>It was a lame point, but it did hook a number of you. He tried to illustrate
>why he thought the no-code arguments were weak by presenting a facetious
>case for eliminating the theory exam, saying that it "filtered out" desirable
>potential amateurs. This is in mockery of those who suggest that Morse exams
>filter out potentially desirable amateurs.

Lameness, of course, is in the eye of the beholder. The current exams do not provide any sort of guarantee that the licensee will be able to deal with interference complaints, nor even recognize causes. Indeed, there is reason to ask the question "what the heck are we supposed to be testing for anyway?".

My wife likes to say that government licenses guarantee a certain level of non-incompetency, and the current amateur exams are no exception.

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

Date: Fri, 19 Feb 1993 22:32:44 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <14600044@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com>, <103380022@hpfcsf.FC.HP.COM>,
<1m22roINNem@cronkite.cisco.com>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Eliminate the Written Exam

In article <1m22roINNem@cronkite.cisco.com> dstine@cisco.com (David Stine) writes:
>In article <103380022@hpfcsf.FC.HP.COM> perry@hpfcsf.FC.HP.COM (Perry Scott)
writes:

>>Nice sarcasm, Alan. Too bad it will be lost on a few.

>

>If it was sarcasm, it was some far too subtle sarcasm for the media by which
>it was conveyed.

>

>I've heard elimination of the written exams proposed before many times by
>those who are simply too lazy to work for the privileges. So if Alan is going
>to try to pass this off as sarcasm, he should first consider the company that
>I and others will presume him to keep from the content of his suggestion
>before he makes it anything less than obvious that he is having a go at those
>who would like everything for nothing.

>

>I'll stand by my flame and I'll relish crafting yet further flames for those

>who are proponents of a system which caters to the least common denominator of
>sheer laziness.

You still miss the point. Laziness, or the lack thereof, has nothing to do with the purpose of licensing or examinations. The only legitimate purpose of licensing of the public airwaves is to ameliorate the horrible *interference* with public safety and broadcasting services that occurred prior to licensing. This is the "basis and purpose" of the Communications Act and the various Radio Conferences that established the authority of regulatory agencies like the FCC in the US. The purpose of licensing is to identify sources of interference and to assure that potential generators of interference have the electrical knowledge to suppress interference to other services via technical or operational means. Morse had a place in the days when the "important" services operated Morse. It allowed for identification of interfering sources since they used a *common modulation coding*. That's now obsolete with the abandonment of Morse by the "important" services. That's also the reason that the FCC restricts the modulation methods used by amateurs to methods *known to the FCC* on frequencies where interference potential is high to international services. Thus things like SS are restricted to UHF and to certain spreading sequences. It's all about interference, not laziness. Filters are a ham myth.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #44
